



Keelham Cottage | Keelham Lane | Todmorden | OL14 8RX | VAT reg: 393 7652 53

Planning Statement

The original application was refused for two reasons:

1. The site lies within the approved Green Belt in the adopted Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan wherein there is a presumption against development for purposes other than those categories specified in Policy GB1 (Development in the Green Belt) or in Section 13 (Protecting Green Belt land) of the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposed development falls outside these specified categories in that it represents a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. This would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which is by definition harmful. This harm is compounded by harm that would be caused to the significance of the listed buildings through the detrimental impact to their character, appearance and setting. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated to justify an exception being made. The application is therefore contrary to policy GB1 of the Calderdale Local Plan and advice contained within Section 13 (Protecting Green Belt land) of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development, by virtue of its size, design, form and siting would over dominate the historic character and appearance of the listed building, in particular the 16th and 17th century elements of greatest significance, and would fail to enhance or preserve the significance of the Grade II Listed Building, its setting and the setting of other listed buildings in close proximity; and there is no clear and convincing justification demonstrated. The resultant development would harm the significance of the designated heritage assets and there are no public benefit to outweigh the harm. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies BT1 and HE1 of the Calderdale Local Plan and paragraphs 199, 200 and 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Returning to the first reason for refusal. The proposed extension has been ruled to be disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. Because of this, it is deemed to constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt

The extension from refused application was built to the front edge along principal elevation and the existing roof verge coping stones were removed, making the roof a continuous form with existing dwelling. This created a larger and more imposing dwelling, not just to Lower Crimsworth Farm but also to their neighbours, Lower Crimsworth House. The visual impact of the extension, by virtue of replicating existing depth and height, gave rise to a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling.

NPPF paragraph 149 states:

A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

(c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

What is disproportionate over and above the size of the original building?



Keelham Cottage | Keelham Lane | Todmorden | OL14 8RX | VAT reg: 393 7652 53

In a planning application in green belt that went to appeal, Oldham Council argued that if an extension was greater than 33% of the volume of the original house then it results in a disproportionate addition and is therefore inappropriate development within the Green Belt. At appeal, the Planning Inspector noted that the guideline figure of 33% is not contained within an adopted policy and there is no explanation of how it has been derived, and as such limited weight was attached to this guideline. The Inspector considered the NPPF refers to size, as well as volume, which involves looking at increases in floorspace and external dimensions. By looking at the extension sideways projection, its set-back and lowering of the extension ridge height, the planning inspector concluded that it was not a disproportionate extension.

Searching Calderdale Planning Policies, there appears to be no indication or rule of thumb regarding disproportionate additions expressed as a percentage.

New Proposal

The proposed extension in the new application, takes on board what the planning inspector mentioned above regarding size, volume, sideways projection, set back, and ridge height.

The side projection is 3.6m (external), the front elevation is set back 0.43m from principal elevation, and the ridge height is 0.2m lower than main dwelling, making the proposed extension subservient to the host dwelling.

In addition to above, if we calculate the area and volume, not only of the proposed extension but also of the conservatory and the 1974 extension, we believe the proposed extension does not result in a disproportionate addition. This is confirmed by the areas and volumes below:

- Original dwelling gross external area – 307m²- volume 748m³
- Extension from 1974 gross external area – 49sqm (15.9%) - volume 142m³ (18.9%)
- Conservatory gross external area – 9.8m² (3%) – volume 30m³ (4%)
- Proposed extension gross external area – 41.4m² (13.4%) - volume 115m³ (15.3%)
- Total area of all extensions = 106.1m² which is 34.4% of original area.
- Total volume of all extensions = 297m³ which is 39.4% of original volume.

Measurements for Lower Crimsworth House are taken from OS map and are gross external area (GEA).

Returning to the second reason for refusal. The previous extension was viewed as over dominate to the historic character and appearance of the listed building, in particular the 16th and 17th century elements of greatest significance. Due to the proposed extension being subservient in design as outlined above, the size changes should overcome this concern. It is worth noting the first floor existing windows either side of the 17th century entrance porch are windows not in keeping with the original design of the building, creating an already harmful aesthetic on the dwelling. The appearance of the extension in terms of materiality (local stone) and window proportion, scale and size respects the character and appearance of the existing host dwelling from the principal elevation. It is noted the existing windows of the host dwelling are not in keeping in terms of design, over time the applicant will seek to apply to replace these. This extension design adheres with Policy BT1 paragraph II Aesthetics and BT1 Sustainability paragraph V (d). The gable elevation, which is more hidden from public

view, will have larger openings to increase daylighting values within the building, reducing the demand on electricity but also allowing views out to the surrounding countryside.

A local precedent of approved two storey side extension on a listed building

Barsey Farm, Saddleworth Road (application number 20/00573/LBC)

This precedent is identical to the proposed submission. It consists of a two-storey side extension on a grade II listed building. The area of the extension is 74.8sqm and original dwelling 245.3sqm giving an increase of 30%. The side projection is 4.8m and the extension was slightly set back 0.3m from main elevation. Ridge line was slightly lower.

See below of proposed extension taken from the application.



The proposed extension is the end bay on right.



Keelham Cottage | Keelham Lane | Todmorden | OL14 8RX | VAT reg: 393 7652 53

Design and Access Statement

Introduction

This statement has been prepared by Reed Studio on behalf of our client Mr and Mrs Barker to support a planning application for a two-storey extension at Lower Crimsworth Farm. The purpose of the extension is to increase the size of the kitchen and two bedrooms. The current kitchen size is too small and not fit for a family of four. The bedrooms are undersized and require additional floorspace to support a modern family.

The existing house, Lower Crimsworth Farm is part of Lower Crimsworth House, a grade II Listed Building and both are typical of dwellings within the immediate vicinity, made from coursed stone with stone slate roof.

Layout

The layout responds carefully to the neighbouring Lower Crimsworth House, respecting the existing exterior form and finishes. The extension steps back from the principal elevation to give importance to the host dwelling. This is also reinforced by the lowered ridge of the extension.

Appearance

The appearance of the extension in terms of materiality (local stone) and window proportion, scale and size respects the character and appearance of the existing host dwelling along the principal elevation. This creates a more harmonious connection with Lower Crimsworth House.

Landscaping

Landscaping will largely remain unaltered.

Access

The site is served by an unadopted road with existing vehicle access close to the front of Lower Crimsworth Farm with a dedicated parking area for many cars.

Existing parking arrangements are unaffected by the development.

Conclusion

As outlined in the planning statement, the proposed extension is set back from the principal elevation, the ridge is lower than the existing dwelling and windows and stonework are all in keeping with the original dwelling. The width of the extension is 3.6m which is a similar width to the 1974 extension. The area and volume totals of all the extensions, when added up in relation to the original Lower Crimsworth House is 34% and 39% respectively.

When all of the above is taken into consideration, we believe the extension is subservient to the main dwelling and thus not a disproportionate addition. And because it is not a disproportionate addition, it does not result in any harm within the Green Belt.

The appearance of the extension in terms of materiality (local stone) and window proportion, scale and size respects the character and appearance of the existing host dwelling from the



Keelham Cottage | Keelham Lane | Todmorden | OL14 8RX | VAT reg: 393 7652 53

principal elevation and as such adheres with Policy BT1 paragraph II Aesthetics and BT1 Sustainability paragraph V (d).

The proposal has been designed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and meets various and national policies. We consider the proposals to be relatively small scale, and its impact on the surrounding properties to be minimal. It is not believed that there are any specific planning limitations that would affect the decision to approve the planning application. We hope the Council can support this application.